



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,153	09/17/2003	Keiji Taniguchi	0033-0902P	4169
2292	7590	12/20/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			KOVALICK, VINCENT E	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			2629	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/20/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,153	TANIGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent E. Kovalick	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 12-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4,6 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2,3,5,7-9 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/17/03 &amp; 10/25/06</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Patent Application, Serial No. 10/664,153, with a File Date of September 17, 2003.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuoka et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0028350) taken with Sall (USP 6,859,219) in view of Hamagishi (USP 6,049,424).

Relative to claim 1, Matsuoka et al. **teaches** converting a two dimensional image into a display format (pg. 1, paras. 0003-0004); Matsuoka et al. further **teaches** electronics comprising: a display portion switching and displaying a two dimensional image and a three-dimensional image (pg. 13, para. 0148);

Matsuoka et al. **does not teach** a detection portion detecting a variation in position of said electronics; and a switching portion operative in response to said detection portion detecting said variation to switch a screen displayed on said display portion from a three-dimensional image to a two-dimensional image.

Art Unit: 2629

Sall teaches a method and apparatus having multiple display devices (col. 1, lines 47-67 and col. 2, lines 1-10); Sall further teaches a detection portion detecting a variation in position of said electronics (col. 9, lines 24-36).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Matsuoka et al. the feature as taught by Sall in order to put in place a signal generating device (spring loaded device) to generate a signal indicating a change of position of the said electronics;

Matsuoka et al. taken with Sall does not teach and a switching portion operative in response to said detection portion detecting said variation to switch a screen displayed on said display portion from a three-dimensional image to a two-dimensional image.

Hamagishi teaches a three dimensional display device (col. 2, lines 45-67; col. 3, lines 1-62); Hamagishi further teaches a switching portion operative in response to said detection portion detecting said variation to switch a screen displayed on said display portion from a three-dimensional image to a two-dimensional image (col. 23, lines 58-61).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Matsuoka et al. taken with Sall the feature as taught by Hamagishi in order to provide the means to display multiple image formats on the same display device, e.g. 2D and 3D.

Regarding claim 4, Hamagishi further teaches a portion compulsorily switching a representation, compulsorily switching to a two-dimensional image a three-dimensional image displayed on a display portion.(col. 23, lines 58-61).

Art Unit: 2629

4. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuoka et al. taken with Sall in view of Hamagishi as applied to claim 4 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Nakazawa et al. (USP 5,434,966).

Relative to claim 6, Matsuoka et al. taken with Sall in view of Hamagishi **does not teach** the electronics wherein a portion compulsorily switching a representation includes a key entry portion; said key entry portion is operated, said portion compulsorily switching a representation operates in response to a key entry operation via said key entry portion .

Nakazawa et al **teaches** a system and method for storing and retrieving three dimensional shapes using two dimensional contrast images.(col. 2, lines 31i-67 and col. 3, lines 1-19); Nakazawa et al. further **teaches** the electronics wherein a portion compulsorily switching a representation includes a key entry portion; said key entry portion is operated, said portion compulsorily switching a representation operates in response to a key entry operation via said key entry portion (col. 2, lines 31-44 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Matsuoka et al. taken with Sall in view of Hamagishi the feature as taught by Nakazawa et al in order to provide the means to facilitate switching from a three dimensional image to a two dimensional image using a input device.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-9 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2629

Relative to claims 2, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record Matsuoka et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0028350); Sall, (USP 6,859,219) and Hamagishi, (USP 6,049,424) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** electronics comprising an alarm setting portion wherein when an alarm set by said alarm setting portion is issued, said switching portion switches a screen displayed on said display portion from a screen in a three-dimensional image to an alarm notice screen in a two-dimensional image.

Relative to claims 3, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics including at least one of a phone call reception portion and a mail reception portion, wherein when said phone call reception portion receives a phone call or said mail reception portion receives mail, said switching portion switches a screen displayed on said display portion from a screen in a three-dimensional image to a phone call or mail reception screen in a two-dimensional image.

Regarding claim 5, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics wherein the three-dimensional image displayed on said display portion is an idle screen in a three-dimensional image.

Relative to claim 7, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics wherein the three-dimensional image displayed on said display portion is an idle screen in a three-dimensional image.

Relative to claim 8 the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics wherein portion compulsorily switching a representation includes a time counting portion; said time counting portion counts a time of displaying a three-dimensional image on said display portion; and when said display portion displays a three-dimensional image for a predetermined period of time, said portion compulsorily switching a representation switches said three-dimensional image on said display portion compulsorily to a two-dimensional image.

Regarding claim 11, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics wherein data for displaying said screen in said 3D image displayed on said display portion and data for displaying said screen in said 2D image displayed on said display portion are identical.

6. Claims 12-22 are allowed.

7. Regarding claim 12, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics comprising a display portion depending on a selection of formation of a parallactic optical system to switch and display a two-dimensional image and a three-dimensional image; a representation switching portion issuing an instruction to switch a representation on said display portion between a two-dimensional image and a three-dimensional image associated with the parallactic optical system; and a data generation portion operative in response to said instruction to generate data of an indication in a two-dimensional image and data of an indication in a three-dimensional image from single data.

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 19, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the said electronics with a first casing and a second casing linked to allow said electronics to be foldable, comprising: a first display portion located inside with said electronics folded, and selectively switching and displaying tow dimensional image and a three-dimensional image; a second display portion located outside with said electronics folded and displaying selected images . a control portion operative in response to said electrics being folded or opened to switch an indication of an idle screen on said first display portion in a three-dimensional image and that of an idle screen on said second display portion in a two-dimensional

***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure..

U. S. Patent No. 5,777,588 Woodgate et al

U. S. Patent No. 5,831,765 Nakayama et al.

U. S. Patent No. 6,392,644 Miyata et al.

***To Respond***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is 571-272-7669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 571-272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Vincent E. Kovalick  
December 13, 2006

  
BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600